

MINUTES OF THE OPEN SESSION
OF THE MEETING OF SENATE

Held on Friday, November 4, 2011, at 2 p.m.
in the Norman D. Hébert, LLD Meeting Room
(Room EV 2.260) on the SGW Campus

PRESENT

Voting members: Prof. A. Akgunduz; Mr. G. Beasley; Mr. N. Burke; Prof. J. Chaikelson; Mr. H. Cheikhzen; Dr. L. Dandurand; Prof. D. Douglas; Dean R. Drew; Prof. A. Dutkewych; Prof. L. Dyer; Mr. A. Filipowich; Prof. J. Garrido; Ms. L. Gill; Mr. P. Gill; Dr. D. Graham; Prof. J. Grant; Mr. B. Hamideh; Ms. M. Hotchkiss; Dean A. Hochstein; Prof. N. Ingram; Mr. J. Kelly; Prof. F. Khendek; Prof. B. Layne; Prof. G. Leonard; Dean B. Lewis; Prof. J. Lewis; Dr. F. Lowy; Prof. M. Magnan; Ms. M. Manson; Mr. K. McLoughlin; Mr. G. Morrow; Ms. H. Nazar; Prof. B. Nelson; Mr. M. Nurujjaman; Prof. M. Peluso; Prof. R. Reilly; Prof. C. Ross; Mr. D. Shakibaian; Prof. W. Sims; Prof. M. R. Soleymani; Mr. R. Sonin; Prof. R. Staseson; Prof. T. Stathopoulos; Prof. J. Turnbull; Dean C. Wild; Mr. C. Wilson; Dr. P. Wood-Adams (*Acting for Dean G. Carr*)

Non-voting members: Mr. P. Beauregard; Dr. D. Boisvert (*Speaker*); Mr. R. Côté; Me B. Freedman; Mr. P. Kelley; Ms. L. Stanbra

ABSENT

Voting members: Prof. J. Camlot; Prof. M. Debbabi; Prof. C. Nikolenyi; Prof. G. Rail; Ms. T. Salameh; Prof. F. Shaver

Non-voting members: Me D. McCaughey

1. Call to order

The Speaker called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

R-2011-8-1 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Graham, Wild), it was unanimously resolved that the Agenda of the Open Session be approved, with the removal of items 5.1 and 5.2 from the Consent section to the Regular section, and that items 3 to 7 (not including items 5.1 and 5.2) be approved or received by consent.*

CONSENT3. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session meeting of October 7, 2011

R-2011-8-2 *The Minutes of the Open Session meeting of October 7, 2011 were approved by consent.*

4. Committee appointments (Document US-2011-8-D1)

R-2011-8-3 *The committee appointments, set out in Document US-2011-8-D1, were approved by consent.*

5. Reports of Senate Standing Committees5.3 Library (Document US-2011-8-D4)

This report was provided for information.

5.4 Research

The October 12 meeting was cancelled.

6. Graduate calendar change regarding in-progress grades (Document US-2011-8-D5)

This document was provided for information.

7. Report and recommendations of the Academic Programs Committee (Document US-2011-8-D6)7.1 Major undergraduate curriculum changes – Office of the Registrar – Advanced Standing/Transfer Credits (Document US-2011-8-D7)

R-2011-8-4 *The major undergraduate curriculum changes in the Office of the Registrar, detailed in Document US-2011-8-D7, were approved by consent, as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2011-8-D6.*

7.2 Major undergraduate curriculum changes – Faculty of Arts and Science7.2.1 Section 31.002 – Program and Admission Requirements (Document US-2011-8-D8)7.2.2 Department of Geography, Planning and Environment (Document US-2011-8-D9)7.2.3 Department of Mathematics and Statistics (Document US-2011-8-D10)7.2.4 Department of Philosophy (Document US-2011-8-D11)7.2.5 Department of Religion (Document US-2011-8-D12)7.2.6 Liberal Arts College (Document US-2011-8-D13)

R-2011-8-5 *The major undergraduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Arts and Science, detailed in Documents US-2011-8-D8 to D13, were approved by consent, as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2011-8-D6.*

7.3 Major undergraduate curriculum changes – Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science – Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering (Document US-2011-8-D14)

R-2011-8-6 *The major undergraduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science, detailed in Document US-2011-8-D14, were approved by consent, as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2011-8-D6.*

7.4 Major undergraduate curriculum changes – Faculty of Fine Arts - Department of Music (Document US-2011-8-D15)

R-2011-8-7 *The major undergraduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Fine Arts, detailed in Document US-2011-8-D15, were approved by consent, as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2011-8-D6.*

7.5 Major undergraduate curriculum changes – John Molson School of Business

7.5.1 Department of Decision Sciences and Management Information Systems (Document US-2011-8-D16)

7.5.2 Department of Finance (Document US-2011-8-D17)

7.5.3 Department of Marketing (Document US-2011-8-D18)

R-2011-8-8 *The major undergraduate curriculum changes in the John Molson School of Business, detailed in Documents US-2011-8-D16 to D18, were approved by consent, as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2011-8-D6.*

7.6 Major graduate curriculum changes – Faculty of Arts and Science

7.6.1 Department of Exercise Science (Document US-2011-8-D20)

7.6.2 Department of Political Science (Document US-2011-8-D21)

7.6.3 Department of Religion (Document US-2011-8-D22)

R-2011-8-9 *The major graduate curriculum changes in the Faculty of Arts and Science, detailed in Documents US-2011-8-D20 to D22, were approved by consent, as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2011-8-D6.*

7.7 Major graduate curriculum changes – John Molson School of Business – Doctor of/Doctorate in Philosophy (Administration) (Document US-2011-8-D23)

R-2011-8-10 *The major graduate curriculum changes in the John Molson School of Business, detailed in Document US-2011-8-D23, were approved by consent, as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2011-8-D6.*

REGULAR

8. Business arising from the Minutes not included on the Agenda

There was no business arising from the Minutes not included on the Agenda.

5.2 Finance (Document US-2011-8-D3)

Prof. Peluso asked for a report on the amount of money spent on all departures over the last ten years, the cost to settle grievances by bargaining unit and the costing of expenditures in relation to eConcordia.

With respect to the cost of departures, Mr. Kelley noted that due to confidentiality concerns and the legal requirements concerning the protection of personal information, only global numbers for the time period in question could be disclosed. The term “cost of departures” has been defined as the amount paid by the University in cases of assisted departures (that is, situations where the decision made to leave the University was not entirely voluntary) to all academic and non-academic staff over the period ten fiscal years.

During that period the University’s total payroll and benefit costs were close to \$2.5 billion. The total costs of all assisted departures during that period were \$14.3 million. As communicated at the May Senate meeting, the total costs related to the departures of senior administrators (Associate Vice-Presidents and above) during the period was \$4.07 million, representing 28.5% of the total costs of assisted departures during that period. The remaining 71.5% (\$10.2 million) of the costs related to the departures of all other academic and non-academic staff from all unions and associations and represented collective agreement obligations as well as contractual commitments. The average of the annual cost of all assisted departures during the period represented 5/9 of 1% of the total payroll of \$2.5 billion.

As for the determination of the costs relating to the settlement of various labour grievances during the last ten years, Mr. Kelley reminded Senators that, unfortunately, as indicated at the May Senate meeting, a response cannot be provided to this question since, in the past, the costs of the settlement of grievances were not monitored centrally. However, a mechanism has now been instituted to track all costs related to the settlement of grievances going forward and this information will therefore be available at the end of the financial year.

Lastly, Dr. Graham indicated that discussions are taking place regarding the University’s relationship with eConcordia, and that for that reason a presentation on eConcordia would be premature at this point, but he undertook to make a presentation to Senate in the New Year once the discussions have reached a conclusion.

Referring to a budget presentation given by Mr. Kelley in May 2010 which referred to program costing, Prof. Leonard asked that such information be included in the 2011/2012 budget presentation.

9. Remarks from the President

Dr. Lowy indicated the importance of the academic plan in our day-to-day work but also for the prestige of the University. In his view, it is unusual for an institution of our stature not to have a plan, and he was pleased that it was being presented to Senate for approval at this meeting.

10. Report and recommendations of the Academic Programs Committee (Document US-2011-8-D6)
- 10.1 Major undergraduate curriculum changes – School of Extended Learning – Institute for Community Development (Document US-2011-8-D19)

Dean Burke explained that the two courses related to experiential learning had previously been approved by Senate as complementary university credit courses. The proposal that they now be offered as elective credits to any undergraduate student is based on the number of students who have taken these courses for complementary credit over the past two years without being granted degree credits and on the desire expressed by students to be able to include the credits as elective courses in their programs. This would be in keeping with the University's commitment to service learning.

Several Senators welcomed this initiative. Dean Burke responded to concerns and questions with respect to registration, placement saturation, the hiring of faculty and the student evaluation process. It was noted that some departments, such as Applied Human Sciences, have expressed reservations as to how these courses could impact their programs and have therefore excluded their students from registering in those courses. Further to a suggestion, Dean Burke agreed to advise all departments so that they can determine the necessity of any exclusion.

R-2011-8-11 Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Burke, Gill), it was unanimously resolved that the major undergraduate curriculum changes in the School of Extended Learning, detailed in Document US-2011-8-D19 be approved, as recommended by the Academic Programs Committee in Document US-2011-8-D6.

11. Approval of the 2011-2016 Academic Plan (Documentation posted at: <http://provost.concordia.ca/academic-planning-budgets-and-facilities/academic-planning/documents-and-resources/>)
- 5.1 Academic Planning and Priorities (Document US-2011-8-D2)

The Speaker noted that further to extensive consultations conducted over the Summer and this Fall as well as the committee of the whole discussion that occurred at the last Senate meeting, modifications were brought to the plan and therefore the final version of the 2011-2016 Academic Plan is being presented for approval. Since Senators had ample opportunity to comment at the last meeting, substantive comments should be limited to changes brought to the plan since the last meeting and basically, at this stage the discussion should focus on Senate's will to approve the plan.

Dr. Graham said that a number of members of the Academic Plan Working Group were present and requested speaking privileges for those members who are not Senators.

Prof. Staseson articulated her experience of the contribution, consultation and collaboration across the University, as a member of the Academic Plan Working Group, over the last year and a half to produce a vision, and then a plan, and then a redraft of the

plan, and then amendments to the re-draft, all produced in good faith, with commitment, integrity and optimism. She emphasized how appreciative and thankful the Working Group is for the hundreds of pages of carefully considered suggestions, tough criticism, and well-crafted comments that helped to change this plan for the better.

Prof. Staseson outlined the process over the last year, which included three "Open to Question" sessions, two visits to each of the Faculty and School Councils and the Libraries, consultation sessions with the full-time and part-time faculty unions and with the CSU, and two visits to individual departments that had asked for sessions to discuss aspects of the academic plan. Moreover, since last Spring, targeted invitations had been widely disseminated throughout the Concordia community to provide feedback. As a result of these meetings and invitations, the Working Group had received hundreds of pages of feedback, including responses by faculty, staff and students, which contributed to major revisions and rethinking during the drafting stages. The plan and its drafts and supporting documents have been available online since last February.

The plan will continue to evolve and shift in response to new information and ideas that will emerge during the implementation. This plan will provide the map that responds to needs Concordia simply must address swiftly, and gives us a series of measures that, once in place, will help to guide our academic mission. This provides us with direction and actions that address the growing needs of this community and that will help us to stay relevant and attractive to new students, faculty and staff. Prof. Staseson said that the Working Group had improved the plan, listened and responded to concerns, made the plan stronger, sensible, and at times with imagination.

Prof. Marius Paraschivoiu reiterated that the Working Group had considered all the feedback and had undertaken an item-by-item review. The plan is a platform for discussion and dialogue. Not all details are included in the plan at this point, but it provides direction and actions. The details of implementation will be overseen by Senate.

A motion to table the approval of the plan until the January 2012 Senate meeting, moved by Mr. Wilson and seconded by Mr. McLoughlin, was defeated.

A discussion ensued, during which Senators conveyed the pros and cons of adopting the plan, summarized as follows:

- Some progress has been made in relation to the details of the plan but there are still a lot of inconsistencies and several points important to students have not found their way into the plan. Extra language has been added regarding undergraduate students without any concrete details. The plan does not address the needs of the existing graduate students. Students are not happy with the plan.
- Supportive of the plan but disturbed to vote on a plan which does not have the support of significant stakeholder.
- The implementation by Senate is not in the plan. Does not feel comfortable in approving the plan since some changes bring new aspects and there is a lot to think about while other items are so open to interpretation.

- The Provost came to the CSU Council on October 26 to present the plan but there are several concerns, and the CSU passed a motion recommending that the adoption of the plan be tabled until January.
- Some revisions to the plan were based on student feedback but an evaluation should be done to ensure that those revisions match student concerns. Should look at the plans of other universities which have more specific actions.
- With respect to the sense of unseemly haste expressed, the Working Group heard advice in the Spring that it was too soon and deferred the proposal accordingly. As for the actions, they speak for themselves. They are specific but complex and will require work. It needs to be decided whether or not Senate oversees the implementation.
- It was pointed out that the student representatives on the FA Council voted in favor of supporting the plan.
- Likes a lot about the plan but not comfortable with voting on it at this time. It would be a tragedy to see a document with so much good adopted without a single student vote. Deferring the approval until January would allow for a better plan.
- Students are acting in good faith and agree that the plan is important, which is the reason that they are asking for more time. Cannot support the plan at this time because of the lack of consensus.
- Tortuous exercise for his department and thanks the Provost and the Working Group for their incredible work. Plan immeasurably better than its first iteration. The objections seem to revolve around three essential questions:
 1. The plan should not be passed until the arrival of a new President. This point was raised, although ambiguously, in the External Governance Review Committee report. Ultimately, it would be a mistake to delay the adoption of the plan, but only if Senate is convinced that this is its plan, not the administration's.
 2. The metrics being used are faulty or useless for some departments, such as the humanities, parts of the social sciences and fine arts. Concerns somewhat appeased by the proposal to use his department for experiment and remains cautiously optimistic with measurement exercise.
 3. With respect to the signature areas, the University has emerging areas of strength which it is recognized for, but we should avoid dividing it into "drones and queen bees" and ensure that all areas are nurtured, including the foundational disciplines of the liberal arts and science.
- As a newcomer to Senate, first exposure to the plan. The document is inordinately difficult to grasp which makes it difficult to formulate proper criticism or understand the ramifications. There are many details left to the implementation phase. Concerns about the budget and voting on the plan as a whole without knowledge of the priorities if the funding comes up short.
- Not everything can be done by 2016. Plan is a roadmap. It is fluid and will change during the course of its life. Based on the assumption that Senate will be diligent in its follow up and that a series of committees will be set up with faculty and students to see to the implementation and make recommendations to change if necessary.
- The Working Group was responsive to the feedback. The plan does not spell out emerging areas as we need to remain open and flexible so that faculty and students can contribute to the plan.

- Commends Working Group. Many public fora were provided and at some point a decision must be taken to adopt and deploy the plan. The plan is a living document, the actions can be modified if required, and its philosophy is where is the University now and how can it become better.
- In the beginning the task was very daunting but after many hours of debate and discussion, is now excited about the plan and looking forward to the future. There is no detailed methodology to take into account the diversity.
- How to improve the academic experience of students was front and center of the Working Group's discussion.
- Why are student groups not specifically identified, since this would empower them and show that you value them?
- Why were students not included in Working Group from day one? A number of Senators feel more discussion is needed and opposed to adopting it now. The vagueness of the plan will create roadblocks for the University and will prevent it from achieving its basic tenets. Not appropriate time to adopt plan now.
- Most encouraging sign to see Senate take the leadership in the discussion; easiest part is to take a risk; hardest part is being vigilant in the implementation. It behooves Senate to hold itself accountable that items are followed through.
- In reference to pages 12 and 13 of the plan that deal with measuring our progress, the use of the verb increase under items 1 and 3 is inappropriate when measuring as a goal. A better verb would be monitor.
- It was proposed that Senate establish an Academic Plan Coordinating Committee as a standing committee to oversee the implementation.

Several comments were repeated in support of the plan, the lack of details regarding its implementation, Senate's role in its oversight and the unfortunate situation of seeking to approve a plan which students do not support. Dr. Graham and Prof. Peluso, who respectively moved and seconded the motion, agreed to add "*and that Senate exercise oversight over the implementation of the Academic Plan*".

Dr. Graham responded to the concerns expressed and reiterated his belief that deferral is not an option at this point. He noted that students will be involved in every vital part of the plan and that it will not end up on a shelf. The plan is ambitious but he is determined to accomplish as much as possible. A full evaluation of the progress against the goals will be done. The adoption of the plan would be a highlight of his career.

A request to conduct the vote by secret ballot was approved by the majority, further to which the vote was taken on the motion as amended and the Speaker announced that it had passed with 26 in favour and 19 opposed.

R-2011-8-12 *Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Graham, Peluso), it was resolved that, upon recommendation of the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, Senate approve the 2011-2016 Academic Plan and that Senate exercise oversight over the implementation of the Academic Plan.*

Prof. Peluso and Provost Graham appealed to Senators to participate in the 2011 Centraide Campaign being held between October 17 and November 17, 2011. They

spoke about the importance of Concordia's commitment to the Centraide Campaign as a component of its community involvement and urged everyone to participate. They referred Senators to the form which was distributed at the meeting and which contains the information on how to make a donation.

12. Motion to delay the start day of the 2012 Winter Term (Document US-2011-8-D24)

Dr. Boisvert said that a motion that classes in the Winter term begin no earlier than January 4 had been tabled at the last Senate meeting to allow Senators to receive more information before voting on this. However, as indicated in Me Freedman's memo to Dr. Lowy, while Senate may make any recommendation it wishes it does not have the authority to determine the date of beginning of classes. Based on the foregoing, Dr. Boisvert asked if Senators wished to lift the motion from the table. A motion to lift the motion from the table, moved by Prof. Ingram and seconded Mr. Kelley, was passed by a majority.

Ms. Stanbra circulated a document which addressed some questions raised at Senate regarding the establishment of the academic schedule. She noted that the January 2012 date has been available and posted on the website for 13 months. The percentage of out-of-province and international students is 23% versus 77% for Quebec residents. In any event, it is common to experience a relatively high absenteeism during the first week of classes. While it is true that Concordia is the first university to begin classes, the dates cannot be considered in isolation.

Ms. Stanbra conveyed the considerations which drive the establishment of the academic calendar, noting that changing one day has major implications. Moreover, in establishing dates for the Winter holiday period, the University ensures compliance with collective and employment agreements and university policy. Therefore, based on consistency and clarity and that it is too late to adequately introduce the change for the January 2012 term, the decision of the President, upon recommendation of his senior management team, is to maintain the 2012 Winter start date of classes on January 3, that the 2013 Winter start date of classes be set on January 7 and that a working group be formed, including Senate representation, to evaluate the start date of classes for 2013 and onward.

A discussion ensued, during which it was noted that 44,000 students and 6,000 staff members felt that the January 3 return date was problematic, and that labour grievances have been lodged contending that the University is not honoring its own policy with respect to employees. It was pointed out that the statistics can be misleading since many students who have established their residence in Quebec are originally from out of town and must travel to visit their family during the holiday period. Some Senators felt that the argument invoked about the extension of leases was weak and wondered why this was not a consideration at other universities. It was noted that while students might be confused by a change of date in this time, they will first and foremost be pleased. Some Senators felt that it was ill advised to change the date this year but emphasized the importance of considering this for the future. It was also noted that this had been raised in the past at Steering Committee and it was hoped that the President was committed to look into the issue.

In response to questions, Ms. Stanbra specified that she had indeed mentioned at the last Senate meeting that changing the date in November would be possible but also difficult. Although there are two make-up days in the calendar, the DNE date would be affected by a change to the start date because the DNE/DISC dates are driven by regulations based on the start date.

R-2011-8-13 Upon motion duly moved and seconded (Filipowich, Peluso), it was resolved to recommend that classes in the Winter term begin no earlier than January 4.

13. Presentation on the results of the National Survey of Student Engagement by Mr. Bradley Tucker (based on the latest public report <http://ipo.concordia.ca/pdfcentre3/?folder=pdfs> which is accessible through the Québec data sharing site: <http://www.crepuq.qc.ca/educq/PCan.html>)

Given the late hour, this presentation was deferred.

14. Items for information

Dr. Graham apprised Senate that the expanded APPC, which includes the four Senate members who sat on the Joint Board/Senate Committee, had met on October 31 and arrived at a good degree of consensus on four of the recommendations. The next meeting is scheduled for November 17, 2011.

15. Question period

- 15.1 Response to question submitted by Mr. Filipowich (Document US-2011-8-D25)

Mr. Filipowich indicated that he will be presenting a motion regarding the academic hearing panels for Senate's consideration at its next meeting.

16. Other business

Ms. Nazar apprised Senators that the GSA and other student associations had voted in favor of participating in the province-wide November 10 student day of action. Ms. Manson asked that academic amnesty be granted to students on that day, further to which Provost Graham explained that professors had been encouraged to exercise leniency and flexibility, where feasible.

17. Next meeting

The next meeting is scheduled to be held on Friday, December 9, 2011, at 2 p.m., in Room EV 2.260.

18. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:40 p.m.



Danielle Tessier
Secretary of Senate